```
Kc7WlevP
1
      UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
      SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK
 2
3
     UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
 4
                V.
                                             20 Cr. 440 (JGK)
5
     ARIK LEV,
6
                    Defendant.
                                              Plea (via telephone)
           -----x
 7
 8
                                              New York, N.Y.
                                              December 7, 2020
9
                                              10:00 a.m.
10
     Before:
11
                           HON. JOHN G. KOELTL,
12
                                              District Judge
13
                               APPEARANCES
14
     AUDREY STRAUSS
15
          Acting United States Attorney for
          the Southern District of New York
16
     BY: JACOB R. FIDDELMAN
          Assistant United States Attorney
17
      COVINGTON & BURLING LLP
18
          Attorneys for Defendant
     BY: ALAN M. VINEGRAD
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

(Case called; appearances noted)

THE COURT: Good morning.

I note that Mr. Lev is present.

All right. We're doing the proceeding this morning by videoconference. There's a national emergency as a result of the pandemic. There's a court emergency also, which our chief judge has declared, as a result of the pandemic. The interests of justice would be harmed if we didn't go forward with the proceeding today because this is a criminal proceeding, and I understand that there's a desire to have the defendant enter a plea to a superseding information. We can't all be present in court because we've restricted in-person court proceedings in the courthouse.

I understand that the defendant has consented that the proceeding may proceed by videoconference. I'm not sure whether the defendant has signed a written waiver yet or authorized his attorney to do that.

Mr. Vinegrad.

MR. VINEGRAD: I mean I can sign it. It hasn't been tendered to me, but I'm happy to execute it promptly upon the end of this proceeding today.

THE COURT: OK. Fine. Mr. Fletcher will send you a copy and consent will then be filed.

Meanwhile, Mr. Lev, do you agree knowingly and voluntarily to have this proceeding by videoconference and to

25

waive your right to be physically present for the conference? 1 2 Mr. Lev. 3 THE DEFENDANT: Do you hear me? 4 THE COURT: Mr. Lev, do you agree that the conference 5 can proceed by videoconference, and do you waive your right to be present physically --6 7 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. THE COURT: -- in court for this proceeding? 8 9 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. THE COURT: OK. I find that the defendant has 10 11 consented knowingly and voluntarily. 12 I should also add at the outset, Mr. Lev, if at any 13 time you want to consult with your lawyer, Mr. Vinegrad, just 14 let us know and we'll make arrangements so that you and your lawyer can consult privately without anyone else listening in. 15 And similarly, if Mr. Vinegrad wants to talk to you, he can do 16 17 that. Just let us know. 18 Do you understand, Mr. Lev? 19 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. Thank you. 20 THE COURT: OK. 21 Mr. Vinegrad. 22 MR. VINEGRAD: Yes, I understand. 23 THE COURT: I should also point out at the outset 24 Mr. Vinegrad is from Covington. I know people personally and

professionally at Covington. My deputy once applied for a job

at Covington, unsuccessfully. Nothing about that affects anything that I do in the case, but I bring those connections to you at the outset.

As another preliminary matter, I don't believe that I've had the opportunity to get together with all of you after Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 5 was amended, so let me --

That's correct, right; I haven't spoken to you.

MR. VINEGRAD: Correct, your Honor.

THE COURT: OK. Pursuant to Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 5(f), I remind the government of its obligation, under Brady v. Maryland and its progeny, to disclose to the defense all information, whether admissible or not, that is favorable to the defendant, material either to guilt or to punishment and known to the government. The government must make good-faith efforts to disclose such information to the defense as soon as reasonably possible after its existence becomes known to the government.

As part of these obligations, the government must disclose information that can be used to impeach the trial testimony of a government witness within the meaning of *Giglio v. United States* and its progeny and must do so sufficiently --

Whoops. We may have lost -- the government just left the meeting so we'll have to wait until the connection with the government is reestablished.

So much for the efficiency of Skype for Business.

MR. VINEGRAD: I've had a lot more success, your

Honor, with Zoom. I know it wasn't getting a lot of favorable

feedback back in March and April, but I think they've improved,

and that, from my experience, has been the mechanism of choice.

I'm trying hard to convince my law firm of the same.

THE COURT: I've had good experience with Zoom also.

MR. VINEGRAD: Yeah, so -- I assume it's OK if we chat until the government comes back. I mean I just actually presided over a mock trial.

THE COURT: I should stop.

MR. VINEGRAD: That's fine.

MR. FIDDELMAN: Hello. This is Jacob Fiddelman again.

I was disconnected by the system. I apologize.

THE COURT: No problem. We don't have your video.

MR. FIDDELMAN: Yes, your Honor.

For some reason when I try and rejoin with the video I'm now getting a message that there's a Skype outage. I dialed in by telephone so that the proceeding was not further delayed, and I'll ask, with the Court's permission, to permit me to simply appear by telephone so that the proceeding can continue.

THE COURT: All right. That's very gracious.

Does the defense have any objection to that?

MR. VINEGRAD: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: OK. We'll proceed.

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C. (212) 805-0300

In your absence, Mr. Fiddelman, we were just commenting that there are problems with Skype and that people's experience with Zoom has been better.

MR. FIDDELMAN: Yeah, I would agree with that, your Honor, in my personal experience.

THE COURT: OK.

Where I was was I was reading the warning under current Rule of Criminal Procedure 5(f).

I saw the point at which you, Mr. Fiddelman, lost contact with us, and it was towards the beginning of that warning, so I'll -- is that correct?

MR. FIDDELMAN: Yes, that's correct.

THE COURT: OK. So I'll start at the beginning with the warning.

Pursuant to Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 5(f), I remind the government of its obligation, under Brady v.

Maryland and its progeny, to disclose to the defense all information, whether admissible or not, that is "favorable to" the defendant, "material either to guilt or to punishment," and known to the government. The government must make good-faith efforts to disclose such information to the defense as soon as reasonably possible after its existence becomes known to the government.

As part of these obligations, the government must disclose information that can be used to impeach the trial

testimony of a government witness, within the meaning of *Giglio* v. United States and its progeny, and must do so sufficiently in advance of trial in order for the defendant to make effective use of it at trial.

I remind you that these obligations are continuing ones and that they apply to information whether or not the government credits it. I further remind the government that, for these purposes, "the government" includes any federal, state and local prosecutors; law enforcement officers and other officials who have participated in the investigation and prosecution of the charged offense or offenses, whether or not such officials are still part of the team; that the government has an affirmative obligation to seek from these sources all information subject to disclosure.

Finally, I caution the government that if it fails to comply with this order any number of consequences may follow:

One, I may order production of information and specify the terms and conditions of such production;

Two, I may grant a continuance;

Three, I may impose evidentiary sanctions;

Four, I may impose sanctions on any responsible lawyer for the government;

Five, I may dismiss charges before trial or vacate a conviction after trial or a quilty plea; or

Six, I may enter any other order that is just under

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

the circumstances.

Mr. Fiddelman, do you understand these obligations and confirm that you have fulfilled or will fulfill them?

MR. FIDDELMAN: Yes, your Honor, I can confirm. Thank you.

THE COURT: OK. In accordance with Rule (f), I will check the docket sheet to see if I've already entered a written order confirming the government's *Brady* obligations, and if not, I'll enter such an order following this proceeding.

Do the parties know, by the way, if I've already entered the 5(f) order?

MR. FIDDELMAN: I am looking right now, your Honor.

One moment, please.

It looks like your Honor has.

THE COURT: OK. I have entered the order already?

MR. FIDDELMAN: Yes, your Honor. You have.

THE COURT: OK. Great. Thank you.

Mr. Fiddelman, tell me where we are.

MR. FIDDELMAN: So, your Honor, the parties have reached a proposed disposition that involves the defendant waiving indictment, agreeing to proceed by a superseding information and entering a plea of guilty to that one-count superseding information charging a violation of 18 U.S.C. Section 371.

THE COURT: All right. In the papers I have before

me, I don't have the waiver. Has the defendant entered the waiver?

MR. FIDDELMAN: Yes, your Honor, he has. It was transmitted to Mr. Fletcher by email over the weekend, I believe. I would be happy to resend it.

THE DEPUTY CLERK: All right. The clerk thought that was forwarded, but let me --

THE COURT: It may have been and I may not have checked my email, so if you'd just take a moment to bring it in.

Mr. Fletcher is just outside the courtroom.

THE DEPUTY CLERK: All right. Let's see.

MR. FIDDELMAN: Your Honor, attached to the same email was a copy of the plea agreement signed by the defense, so the copy of the plea agreement that the Court has may not have been signed by the defense yet, and so that additional document may need to be printed and brought to the Court.

THE COURT: OK. Yes, I have the superseding information and the November 17 plea agreement signed by the government but not by the defense.

THE DEPUTY CLERK: The clerk is printing out the document as we speak. The clerk will execute the waiver as a witness and will submit it to the Court, who is in the courtroom.

THE COURT: OK. There's no one in the courtroom but

Kc7WlevP 1 me, so --2 THE DEPUTY CLERK: Yes. 3 THE COURT: All right. I will include the arraignment on the superseding information together with the allocution on 4 5 the guilty plea. 6 I take it, Mr. Vinegrad, that the defendant wishes to 7 waive indictment, agree to proceed by information and enter a plea of guilty to the superseding information. 8 9 MR. VINEGRAD: Yes, your Honor. 10 THE COURT: OK. 11 Mr. Fletcher, please administer the oath to the 12 defendant. 13 THE DEPUTY CLERK: Mr. Lev, would you please raise your right hand. 14 15 You do so solemnly swear that what you say to this 16 Court in this proceeding shall be true and accurate, so help 17 you God? 18 THE DEFENDANT: I hereby affirm. 19 THE DEPUTY CLERK: Mr. Lev? Mr. Lev, can we hear you? 20 We can't hear you. Can you unmute? 21 THE COURT: No. I heard Mr. Lev say, "I hereby 22

affirm," but you can ask again. Just --

THE DEPUTY CLERK: OK.

23

24

25

Mr. Lev, do you hereby affirm that what you say to this Court in this proceeding shall be true and accurate?

```
THE COURT: Now I don't hear.
1
               THE DEFENDANT: Hear me now?
 2
               THE DEPUTY CLERK: Yes. I'll re-administer.
 3
 4
               THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
 5
               THE COURT: Thank you.
 6
               THE DEPUTY CLERK: Do you hereby affirm that what you
 7
      say to this Court in this proceeding shall be true and
8
      accurate?
9
               THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir. Yes, your Honor, I will.
10
               THE DEPUTY CLERK: You can put your hand down.
11
               Please state your name for the record, your full name.
12
               THE DEFENDANT: My name is Arik Lev.
13
               THE DEPUTY CLERK: Thank you.
14
               THE COURT: Mr. Lev, do you understand that you are
      now under oath and that if you answer any of my questions
15
16
      falsely, your false or untrue answers may later be used against
17
      you in another prosecution for or making a false statement?
18
               THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.
19
               THE COURT: Tell me your full name, please.
20
               THE DEFENDANT: My name is Arik Lev.
21
               THE COURT: How old are you?
22
               THE DEFENDANT:
                               48.
23
               THE COURT: 48?
24
               THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir. Yes, your Honor.
25
               THE COURT: OK. How far did you go in school?
```

```
1
               THE DEFENDANT: High school.
 2
               THE COURT: Are you a citizen of the United States?
 3
               THE DEFENDANT: No, your Honor. I'm on a green card.
 4
     My wife and my kids are citizens.
 5
               THE COURT: Are you able to speak and understand
6
      English?
 7
               THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.
 8
               THE COURT: Are you now or have you recently been
9
      under the care of a doctor or a psychiatrist?
10
               THE DEFENDANT: Not, your Honor.
11
               THE COURT: Have you ever been treated or hospitalized
12
      for any mental illness or any type of addiction, including drug
13
      or alcohol addiction?
14
               THE DEFENDANT: Not, your Honor.
15
               THE COURT: In the past 24 hours, have you taken any
      drugs, medicine or pills, or have you drunk any alcohol?
16
17
               THE DEFENDANT: No, your Honor.
18
               THE COURT: Is your mind clear today?
19
               THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir. Yes, your Honor.
20
               THE COURT: Are you feeling all right today?
21
               THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.
22
               THE COURT: Do either counsel have any doubt as to the
23
      defendant's competence to waive indictment, agree to proceed by
24
      information and enter a plea of quilty to the information at
25
      this time?
```

25

1 Mr. Vinegrad. 2 MR. VINEGRAD: No, your Honor. 3 THE COURT: Mr. Fiddelman. 4 MR. FIDDELMAN: No, your Honor. 5 THE COURT: Mr. Lev, Mr. Vinegrad, your lawyer, has 6 informed me that you wish to enter -- that you wish to waive 7 indictment, agree to proceed by information and enter a plea of guilty to the superseding information. 8 9 Is that what you wish to do? 10 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. 11 THE COURT: Have you had a full opportunity to discuss 12 your case with Mr. Vinegrad and to discuss the consequences of 13 waiving indictment, agreeing to proceed by information and 14 entering a plea of guilty to the superseding information? 15 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. THE COURT: Are you satisfied with Mr. Vinegrad and 16 17 his representation of you? 18 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. THE COURT: On the basis of Mr. Lev's responses to my 19 20 questions and my observations of his demeanor, I find that he 21 is fully competent to enter an informed plea at this time. 22 Now, Mr. Lev, before I accept any plea from you, I'm 23 going to be asking you certain questions. My questions are 24 intended to satisfy me that you wish to enter a plea of quilty

because you are, in fact, guilty and that you fully understand

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

the consequences of your plea, and furthermore, that you are pleading guilty knowingly and voluntarily and that there's independent basis in fact for your plea.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: I'm now going to describe to you certain rights that you have under the Constitution and laws of the United States, which rights you will be giving up if you enter a plea of guilty. Please listen to me very carefully. If there's anything that I say that you don't understand, please ask me to stop and either I or Mr. Vinegrad will explain it to you more fully. All right?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Lev, under the Constitution and laws of the United States, you have a right to a speedy and public trial by a jury on the charges against you, which are contained in the superseding information.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: If there were a trial, you would be presumed to be innocent and the government would be required to prove you guilty by competent evidence and beyond a reasonable doubt. You would not have to prove that you were innocent at trial.

Do you understand that?

25

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: If there were a trial, a jury composed of 12 people selected from this district would have to agree unanimously that you were guilty.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: If there were a trial, you would have the right to be represented by a lawyer, and if you could not afford a lawyer, a lawyer Would be provided to you free of cost.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: In fact, Mr. Lev, you have a right to be represented by a lawyer at trial and at every other stage of the proceeding, and if you cannot afford a lawyer, a lawyer would be provided to you free of cost.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: If there were a trial, you would have the right to see and hear all of the witnesses against you, and your attorney could cross-examine them. You would have a right to have your attorney object to the government's evidence and offer evidence on your behalf if you so desired, and you would have the right to have subpoenas issued or other compulsory process used to compel witnesses to testify in your defense,

25

all.

1 and you would not be required to testify. 2 Do you understand all of that? 3 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. 4 THE COURT: If there were a trial, you would have the 5 right to testify if you wanted to, but no one could force you 6 to testify if you didn't want to, and furthermore, no inference 7 or suggestion of guilt could be drawn if you chose not to testify at trial. 8 9 Do you understand that? 10 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. 11 THE COURT: Mr. Lev, do you understand each and every 12 one of the rights that I've described to you? 13 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. 14 THE COURT: Do you have any questions about any of 15 those rights? 16 THE DEFENDANT: No, not, your Honor. 17 THE COURT: Do you understand that by entering a plea 18 of guilty today, you are giving up each and every one of those 19 rights; that you are waiving those rights and that you will 20 have no trial? 21 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. 22 THE COURT: Do you understand that you can change your 23 mind right now and refuse to enter a plea of guilty? You don't 24 have to enter this plea if you don't want to for any reason at

1

```
Do you understand that completely?
 2
               THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.
 3
               THE COURT: Now, Mr. Lev, you've received a copy of
 4
      the superseding information against you, is that correct?
 5
               THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.
6
               THE COURT: All right. Now, I have a copy of a waiver
 7
      of indictment. It says, "United States of America v. Arik Lev,
      the above-named defendant, who is accused of violating Title
8
9
      18, United States Code, Section 371, being advised of the
10
      nature of the charge and of his rights, hereby waives in open
11
      court prosecution by indictment and consents that the
12
     proceeding may be by information instead of by indictment."
13
               This appears to be signed by you and Mr. Vinegrad.
14
      It's dated December the 7th, and it's witnessed by
15
     Mr. Fletcher.
               Now, Mr. Lev, have you signed this waiver of
16
17
      indictment?
18
               THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.
19
               THE COURT: Before you signed it, did you discuss it
20
      with your lawyer?
21
               THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.
22
               THE COURT: Did he explain it to you?
23
               THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.
24
               THE COURT: Do you understand what you are doing?
25
               THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.
```

1	THE COURT: Do you understand that you are under
2	absolutely no obligation to waive indictment and agree to
3	proceed by information?
4	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.
5	THE COURT: Do you understand that if you did not
6	waive indictment and if the government wanted to prosecute you
7	on the charge which is contained in the information, the
8	government would have to present its case to a grand jury,
9	which may or may not indict you?
10	THE DEFENDANT: I understand, your Honor.
11	THE COURT: Do you understand that by signing this
12	waiver of indictment, you have given up your right to have your
13	case presented to a grand jury?
14	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.
15	THE COURT: Do you understand what a grand jury is?
16	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.
17	THE COURT: Did anyone make any threats or promises to
18	you to get you to waive indictment and agree to proceed by
19	information?
20	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.
21	THE COURT: Did you sign this waiver of indictment
22	knowingly and voluntarily?
23	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.
24	THE COURT: I find that the defendant's waiver of
25	indictment is knowing and voluntary.

Now, Mr. Lev, you've told me that you've seen a copy of the superseding information against you. Is that correct?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Have you discussed it with your lawyer?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you want me to read it aloud to you in open court, or do you wish to give up -- or waive -- the reading of the information?

THE DEFENDANT: I wish to give up this reading because my lawyer discussed with me. Thank you.

THE COURT: OK. All right. I'm going to go over the information with you in any event because I want to make sure that you understand what the government would be required to prove beyond a reasonable doubt before you could be convicted of the charge at trial, and I also want to make sure that you understand what the maximum penalties are for the charge.

The information charges a conspiracy to commit bank fraud and wire fraud. It charges, in substance, that from at least in or about January 2018 up to and including at least in or about November 2019, in the Southern District of New York and elsewhere, Arik Lev, the defendant, and others known and unknown, willfully and knowingly did combine, conspire, confederate and agree together and with each other to commit offenses against the United States, to wit, wire fraud, in violation of Title 18, United States Code, Section 1343, and

bank fraud, in violation of Title 18, United States Code,
Section 1344. It was a part and an object of the conspiracy
that Arik Lev, the defendant, and others known and unknown,
willfully and knowingly, having devised and intending to devise
a scheme and artifice to defraud and for obtaining money and
property by means of false and fraudulent pretenses
representations and promises would and did transmit and cause
to be transmitted by means of wire and radio communication in
interstate and foreign commerce writings, signs, signals,
pictures and sounds for the purpose of executing such scheme
and artifice, in violation of Title 18, United States Code,
Section 1343.

In furtherance of the conspiracy and to effect the illegal object thereof, the following overt acts, among others — it says others, but there's only one charged — following overt act, among others, was committed in the Southern District of New York and elsewhere, namely, on or about February 16, 2018, Arik Lev, the defendant, caused to be submitted an electronic loan application for a vehicle purchased on behalf of a straw purchaser that contained false and fraudulent misrepresentations after causing the straw purchaser to travel through the Southern District of New York to the car dealership at which the loan application was prepared and submitted, in violation of Title 18, United States Code, Section 371.

Do you understand that's a summary of the charge against you in Count One of the superseding information?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: And you understand if you did not plead guilty the government would be required to prove beyond a reasonable doubt at trial:

First, that two or more persons entered into the unlawful agreement charged in the information, starting in or about January 2018;

Second, that you, the defendant, knowingly and willfully became a member of the conspiracy;

Third, that one of the members of the conspiracy knowingly committed at one overt act charged in the information in furtherance, in order to further some objective of the conspiracy.

Do you understand the government would be required to prove all of that beyond a reasonable doubt at trial?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you understand that the maximum penalty for the crime charged in Count One is a maximum of five years' imprisonment; a maximum term of three years' supervised release; a maximum fine of the greatest of \$250,000 or twice the gross pecuniary gain derived from the offense or twice the gross pecuniary loss to a person or persons other than yourself as a result of the offense; and a \$100 mandatory special

assessment?

Do you understand that's the maximum penalty for the crime charged in Count One of the information?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you also understand that when I talk about supervised release, supervised release means that you will be subject to monitoring when you are released from prison and that the monitoring is to be under terms and conditions which could lead to reimprisonment without a jury trial if you violate them?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you understand that if you violated the terms of supervised release and were sentenced to prison, you could be sentenced to prison for the entire term of supervised release without any credit for any time you had already spent on supervised release?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you also understand that as part of your sentence I can also order restitution to any person injured as a result of your criminal conduct?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: The information also includes a forfeiture allegation. It charges that as a result of committing the offense charged in Count One, you, the defendant, shall forfeit to the United States any and all property, real and personal,

2.2

that constitutes or is derived from proceeds traceable to the commission of the offense, including, but not limited to, a sum of money in United States currency representing the amount of proceeds traceable to the commission of the offense, and if any of that forfeitable property cannot be located or has been transferred or deposited with a third person or placed beyond the jurisdiction of the court or substantially diminished in value or commingled with other property, then it's the intent of the government to seek forfeiture of any other property that you have up to the value of the forfeitable property.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: So do you understand that as part of your sentence I can also order forfeiture?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you also understand that if I accept your guilty plea and adjudge you guilty, that adjudication can be used to remove you from the United States, to deny you citizenship, to deny you admission to the United States in the future?

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: And have you consulted with your lawyer about the immigration consequences of your guilty plea?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you also understand that if I accept your guilty plea and adjudge you guilty, that adjudication may deprive you of valuable civil rights, such as the right to vote, the right to hold public office, the right to serve on a jury and the right to possess any kind of firearm?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Now, Mr. Lev, under current law, there are sentencing guidelines that judges must consult in determining your sentence. You've spoken to your attorney about the sentencing guidelines, haven't you?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you understand that I, as the sentencing court, will not be able to determine your guidelines sentence until after a presentence report has been completed by the probation department and after you and your lawyer and the government have had a chance to challenge any of the facts reported by the probation department?

THE DEFENDANT: I understand, your Honor.

THE COURT: And do you also understand that even after it's determined what guideline sentencing range applies in your case, I have the authority, in some circumstances, to depart upward or downward from the sentencing guideline range that is otherwise called for by the guidelines?

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C. (212) 805-0300

THE COURT: And even after I've made that determination of the appropriate guidelines sentencing range, taking into account any upward or downward departures, I must then consult other statutory factors in order to arrive at a final conclusion as to what the appropriate and reasonable sentence is in your case.

Do you --

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: -- understand that?

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. Thank you. Yeah.

THE COURT: And do you also understand that if you are sentenced to prison, parole has been abolished and you will not be released any earlier on parole?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: You paused. Do you understand that? Do you want me to explain that to you?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: OK. There used to be a system, in the federal system, whereby it was possible for a defendant to be released substantially before the term of imprisonment had ended if there was a favorable decision by the parole commission or the parole board so that the defendant would only have to spend a fraction of the time that was imposed as a sentence on the defendant. That system of parole has now been

abolished in the federal system so that when a sentence is imposed on a defendant, the defendant will serve that sentence except for what is known as good-time credit, which amounts to a little less than two months for every full year that the defendant spends in prison.

So I advise you that the system of parole has been abolished so that you would not be released any earlier on parole.

THE DEFENDANT: I understand, sir. Thank you.

THE COURT: OK.

THE DEFENDANT: I understand.

THE COURT: Do you also understand that if your lawyer or anyone else has attempted to estimate or predict what your sentence will be, that their estimate or prediction could be wrong?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: No one, Mr. Lev -- not your lawyer, not the government -- can or should give you any assurance of what your sentence will be since that sentence can only be determined after the probation department has completed the presentence report, after I have ruled on any challenges to the report, and after I've determined what the appropriate and reasonable sentence is in your case.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: And do you also understand that even if your sentence is different from what your lawyer or anyone else told you that it might be or if it's different from what you expect it to be, you'll still be bound by your guilty plea and you will not be allowed to withdraw your plea of guilty? Do you understand that? THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. THE COURT: Now, Mr. Lev, I've been given the plea agreement, which is a November 17, 2020, letter, addressed to your lawyer, Mr. Vinegrad, from the government. It's signed by Mr. Fiddelman and approved by Ms. Mermelstein. It appears to have been signed by you on November the 17th and approved by Mr. Vinegrad on December 2, 2020. I'll mark that as Court Exhibit 1. Have you signed this plea agreement? THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. THE COURT: Did you read the agreement before you signed it? THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. THE COURT: Did you discuss it with your lawyer before you signed it? THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. THE COURT: Did you fully understand the agreement before you signed it? THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

imprisonment.

THE COURT: Does this letter agreement constitute your complete and total understanding of the entire agreement between the government, your lawyer and you? THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. THE COURT: Is everything that you understand about your plea and your sentence contained in this plea agreement? THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. THE COURT: Has anything been left out? THE DEFENDANT: There's not, your Honor. The judge, just the sealing. That's what I understand. THE COURT: OK. You're right. The judge is not bound by this plea agreement at all. Do you understand that? THE DEFENDANT: Yes. Yes, your Honor. THE COURT: OK. Has anyone offered you any inducements or threatened you or forced you to plead quilty or to enter into the plea agreement? THE DEFENDANT: Not, your Honor. THE COURT: There is a provision in the plea agreement that says, "It is agreed that the defendant will not file a direct appeal nor bring a collateral challenge, including, but not limited to, an application under Title 28, United States

SOUTHERN DISTRICT REPORTERS, P.C. (212) 805-0300

Code, Section 2255 and/or Section 2241 of any sentence within

or below the stipulated quideline range of 33 to 41 months'

```
1
               Do you understand that?
 2
               THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.
 3
               THE COURT: So do you understand that if I sentenced
 4
      be to 41 months' imprisonment or less, you have given up your
 5
      right to appeal any such sentence or to challenge any such
      sentence in any habeas corpus proceeding?
6
 7
               Do you understand that?
 8
               THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.
9
               THE COURT: Do you also understand that you have given
10
      up, or waived, your right to appeal any term of supervised
11
      release of three years or less, any fine of --
12
               It says 150,000, but I would have thought it should
13
      read 250,000.
14
               MR. FIDDELMAN: Your Honor --
15
               MR. VINEGRAD: Sorry.
16
               THE COURT: Go ahead, please.
17
               MR. FIDDELMAN: So, the $150,000 number is correct.
18
      The waiver applies to the top of the guidelines range for
19
      the --
20
               THE COURT: You're right.
21
               MR. FIDDELMAN: -- rather than the statutory maximum.
22
               THE COURT: Thank you. You're right. You're right.
23
               Mr. Lev, do you understand that you've waived any
24
      right to appeal any fine of $150,000 or less and any special
25
      assessment of $100 or less?
```

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, I do.

Do you --

THE COURT: -- understand?

OK.

The plea agreement also reaffirms that, as I've told you, that because you're not a citizen of the United States, your guilty plea and conviction make it very likely that you will be removed from the United States and that you're presumptively, and that's presumptively mandatory and that at a minimum you are at risk of being removed or suffering other adverse immigration consequences.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: And it affirms that you've discussed the possible immigration consequences, including removal, as a result of your guilty plea and conviction with your lawyer. Is that right?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: OK. As you mentioned before, you understand that the Court is not bound by the plea agreement or by any of the provisions of the plea agreement; the Court has to make an independent determination of the appropriate sentence in your case, and even if that sentence differs from anything that's contained in the plea agreement, you will still be bound by your guilty plea and you will not be allowed to

withdraw your plea of guilty.

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Mr. Vinegrad, do you know of any valid defense that would prevail at the trial of Mr. Lev?

MR. VINEGRAD: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you know of any reason why Mr. Lev should not be permitted to plead guilty?

MR. VINEGRAD: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: OK.

Mr. Lev, tell me what you did in connection with the crime to which you are entering a plea of guilty.

THE DEFENDANT: So, your Honor, in 2018 to '19, I was agree with other people to do a transactions that basically buy, buy cars and pay for them and move, put them into a rental company without to tell it to the financial institute for the, to the bank that loan money for the vehicle, that the car will be used for, to do rental, rent a car. And has make a false statements to the financial company and they will — we also didn't tell them that we, I will pay the payments of the vehicle, not the people that bought the car. So we didn't tell them that, who was going to pay for the vehicle, that I was the one that's paying for the vehicle, and I understand that was — Ivan was involved in applications to the banks to approve the transactions. And I'm very sorry that's happen.

I wasn't aware that, in that time that I did something wrong. I'm fully aware that this was wrong, and if I had the chance again, I will not do it again, anything connected with something like that. That's why I want to take responsibility on my conduct, and I'm sorry for that.

THE COURT: OK.

MR. FIDDELMAN: Your Honor, I'm sorry to interrupt. I just have a question.

I'm not sure I understood something that the defendant said. I thought he said he was not aware at the time that he was doing something wrong, but I may have misheard it.

THE COURT: I was going to follow up, but as long as the government asks the question, Mr. Lev --

THE DEFENDANT: Yeah, I was aware that I do something wrong, so --

THE COURT: At the time.

THE DEFENDANT: At the time that I did, we did something wrong by telling -- we didn't tell the bank, the financial institute what we doing, what we going to use the car for. Yes, sir. I was aware about that, and that's why I want to plead guilty for.

THE COURT: All right. Let me go back.

Between 2018 and 2019, you agreed with others to do transactions that would, the object of which was to buy cars, is that right?

```
1
               THE DEFENDANT: Yes. Yes, your Honor.
               THE COURT: OK.
 2
 3
               THE DEFENDANT: Buy them and --
 4
               THE COURT: And the cars would be put into a rental
 5
      company.
 6
               THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.
 7
               THE COURT: And in order to buy the cars, there were
      transaction documents that were submitted to banks in order to
8
9
      finance the purchase of the cars.
10
               THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.
11
               THE COURT: Is that right?
12
               THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor, and I paid for the
13
      cars and the bank paid for the cars.
14
               THE COURT: OK. You paid for the car. The banks paid
15
      for the cars. You agreed to make payments to the banks in
16
      order to pay for the cars, but the financing documents
      indicated that other people were going to be making the
17
18
      payments rather than you.
               THE DEFENDANT: Exactly, your Honor. That's exact --
19
20
               THE COURT: And those were false statements to the
21
      banks.
22
               THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. That I was the one
23
      that paying for the vehicle.
24
               THE COURT: You were the one who was actually paying
25
      for the vehicles, but other people were listed as the people
```

who were paying for the vehicles.

THE DEFENDANT: Has responsibility for the vehicle, yes, sir. Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Has responsibility.

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: And it was not disclosed to the bank that the cars were not being used for personal use but were going into a rental car company.

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor, exactly.

THE COURT: And the financial documents otherwise would have required that that be disclosed, that the cars were not being used for personal use but were being used for a rental car company, is that correct?

THE DEFENDANT: Uh, yes. Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: OK. And the information says that one overt act in furtherance of the conspiracy was that on or about February 16, 2018, you caused to be submitted an electronic loan application for a vehicle purchase on behalf of a straw purchaser, someone acting as a purchaser who was not really a purchaser, and that the application contained false and fraudulent misrepresentations, after causing the straw purchaser to travel through the Southern District of New York to the car dealership at which the loan application was prepared and submitted. Did you do that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

1	THE COURT: OK. And
2	THE DEFENDANT: Me or others.
3	THE COURT: I'm sorry.
4	THE DEFENDANT: It's me or others that's involved in
5	this, did that.
6	THE COURT: OK.
7	THE DEFENDANT: Which one I did or other did it, but I
8	was involved in that. That's why I'm here.
9	THE COURT: You knew that there were straw purchasers,
10	people who were not really purchasing
11	THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
12	THE COURT: in the cars for themselves
13	THE DEFENDANT: Yes.
14	THE COURT: who traveled to the car dealership.
15	The car dealership was in New Jersey, was it?
16	THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.
17	THE COURT: And
18	THE DEFENDANT: In New Jersey and in New York.
19	THE COURT: Where in New York?
20	THE DEFENDANT: Was in Brooklyn, was in New Jersey,
21	and probably some of the people pass through Manhattan to, to
22	go to the other district, in New Jersey.
23	THE COURT: OK.
24	THE DEFENDANT: Not
25	THE COURT: You knew that people were

25

1 THE DEFENDANT: Going --THE COURT: -- were traveling through Manhattan or the 2 3 Bronx in order to go to the car dealership in New Jersey to 4 sign --5 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 6 THE COURT: Mr. Vinegrad --7 THE DEFENDANT: I don't know that. THE COURT: -- is indicating that he's uncomfortable 8 9 with this question. 10 MR. VINEGRAD: I mean, obviously, your Honor, could 11 fully allocute the defendant as your Honor sees fit. Based on 12 prior discussions with Mr. Lev, without waiving any privileges, 13 I'm not sure he's in a position to allocute that he knew that a 14 straw purchaser or purchasers were actually traveling through 15 the Southern District of New York. We're absolutely prepared to accept the government's proffer of that, which I understand 16 17 they are prepared to make, and for purposes of an acceptable 18 guilty plea, I do think that is legally sufficient, so that's 19 why I was --20 THE COURT: OK. 21 MR. VINEGRAD: -- my head. 22 THE COURT: I don't want Mr. Lev to say anything that 23 is not accurate or that he doesn't know. 24 You probably understand, Mr. Lev, that the reason for

the questions I'm asking is a technical concept of venue.

defendant has the right to be prosecuted for a crime in a district where the crime occurred, and a crime occurs — the crime of conspiracy occurs where the conspiracy is formed or where any overt act in furtherance of the conspiracy is committed. And an overt act can be committed by the defendant or by any coconspirator.

And so one way of committing an overt act would be if a person moved through or was caused, rather caused to be moved through the Southern District of New York in furtherance of the conspiracy. The Southern District of New York includes

Manhattan, the Bronx, Westchester and some northern counties.

It does not include New Jersey.

So could the government make a proffer as to why venue is proper in the Southern District of New York.

THE DEFENDANT: Are you asking me for --

THE COURT: No, no. I'm asking the government lawyer to make a statement of how the government would prove venue for this crime in the Southern District of New York.

And the defendant can waive venue. The defendant can agree that venue would be established and, in any event, could waive the requirement of venue and agree that the charge could be prosecuted in the Southern District of New York, but let's hear from the government how the government would prove venue at trial.

Mr. Fiddelman.

MR. FIDDELMAN: Yes, your Honor. Thank you.

The conspiracy in this case involved transactions occurring at a number of different car dealerships. Some of those dealerships were in New Jersey, and the defendant's dealership and rental business was in Brooklyn, New York. The various transactions in furtherance of the conspiracy involved events occurring at both locations.

With respect to events in New Jersey, those transactions involved coconspirators -- namely, the codefendant charged in this case, Ivan Magidov -- and others traveling from Brooklyn through the Southern District of New York to get to New Jersey.

Vice versa, the occurrences in Brooklyn involved the straw purchasers, both of whom were New Jersey residents, traveling through the Southern District of New York to get from New Jersey to Brooklyn. So there were numerous instances of travel in furtherance of the conspiracy through the Southern District of New York.

THE COURT: OK.

Mr. Lev are you prepared to accept that the government could prove venue in the Southern District of New York if there were acts in furtherance of the conspiracy by coconspirators that occurred in the Southern District of New York; namely, Manhattan, the Bronx, Westchester, or some northern counties?

Brooklyn is not in the Southern District of New York,

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

nor is New Jersey.

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. I accept that it's not me personally who did it, and I wasn't -- yes, sir.

THE COURT: OK. And as I said, you're perfectly prepared to consult with your lawyer at any time.

THE DEFENDANT: OK.

MR. VINEGRAD: Just to be clear, I think what he's saying is even though he did not personally travel through the Southern District of New York and he doesn't know of his personal knowledge whether other people did, he is agreeable and prepared to accept the government's proffer on venue.

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: OK. All right. And if there's any doubt about that, does the defendant waive any defense of improper venue?

Mr. Vinegrad.

MR. VINEGRAD: The answer -- he does.

THE COURT: Do you agree with that, Mr. Lev?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: OK. When you did the acts that you described to me, did you know that what you were doing was wrong and illegal?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor, because the parts are fitting. Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: I'm sorry.

MR. VINEGRAD: Yes, your Honor. I feel very wrong about it.

THE COURT: OK.

Does the government want me to ask any other questions of the defendant?

MR. FIDDELMAN: I don't believe so, your Honor. Thank you.

THE COURT: OK. Tell me what the government's evidence would be at trial against the defendant.

MR. FIDDELMAN: Yes, your Honor.

At trial the government would present evidence, proving beyond a reasonable doubt, that in or about 2018 the defendant and others were part of a conspiracy to defraud banks and auto lenders into extending auto loans under false pretenses.

The defendants first purchased high-end automobiles at auction and then increased the price of those vehicles and resold them back to himself through undisclosed straw purchasers who had good personal credit scores. Those transactions were financed, and the loan applications submitted on behalf of the straw purchasers falsely stated that the straw purchasers were buying the vehicles for their own personal use and were buying them themselves when, in fact, the defendants had promised to pay the loans on the vehicle, immediately took possession of each of the vehicles after the straw transaction,

and then used the vehicles to start a street rental business.

As a result the defendant both received the loan proceeds from the bank and also received the vehicle, thereby stealing the loan proceeds from the bank through fraud. The defendant then stopped making payments on the vehicles shortly thereafter, and all of the loans defaulted.

The total amount of money that the banks were defrauded out of in this scheme was in excess of \$1 million. Some of the banks were FDIC-insured and some of the banks were located in states other than New York and received false loan applications over the internet.

The defendant, Arik Lev, specifically was one of the principal architects who supervised the scheme. He owned the car dealership and rental business that were involved in the offense, and he purchased the vehicles at auction with his own money to accomplish this scheme at the outset.

He directed one of his employees, codefendant Ivan
Magidov, to prepare and submit several false loan applications
among other tasks.

Lev also retained possession of each of the vehicle and the loan proceeds.

And as I previously mentioned, the conspiracy involved travel through the Southern District of New York by coconspirators on many occasions in furtherance of the conspiracy. And the government submits that its evidence as

described would prove the defendant's guilt beyond a reasonable 1 2 doubt. 3 THE COURT: Mr. Lev, there are a couple of questions that I should have asked. You've heard the government say that 4 5 the banks that made the loans were insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, which would be an element of the 6 7 offense of bank fraud as one of the objects of the conspiracy. 8 Are you prepared to accept that the government could 9 prove that the banks to which these loan applications were made 10 were insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation? 11 THE DEFENDANT: Uh, uh, yes, your Honor. Yes, your 12 Honor. 13 THE COURT: OK. 14 THE DEFENDANT: I didn't know anybody would get hurt from these transactions. 15 THE COURT: I'm sorry. I just didn't hear the end. 16 17 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. I say --18 MR. FIDDELMAN: Your Honor --19 THE COURT: Yes. 20 MR. FIDDELMAN: I'm sorry. 21 THE COURT: Hold on. The government wanted to say 22 something. 23 Mr. Fiddelman. 24 MR. FIDDELMAN: Thank you, your Honor. 25 I was just going to say I believe the defendant said

24

25

```
he didn't know anyone was going to get hurt from the
1
 2
      transactions.
 3
               MR. VINEGRAD: I mean this is on the issue of the
 4
     FDIC, I believe.
 5
               THE DEFENDANT: Yeah.
 6
               MR. VINEGRAD: So, yeah. OK.
 7
               Your Honor, I think similar to the venue situation,
     Mr. Lev I don't believe can allocute that he knew that one or
8
9
     more of the financial institutions was a member of the FDIC.
10
      However, he is prepared to accept the government's proffer of
11
      that particular aspect of the charge.
12
               THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. Yes, I am.
13
               THE COURT: Do you agree with what your lawyer has
14
      said?
15
               THE DEFENDANT: Yes. Uh, yes, your Honor.
16
               MR. VINEGRAD: Thank you, your Honor.
17
               THE DEFENDANT: Say something.
18
               THE COURT: OK.
19
               MR. FIDDELMAN: Your Honor --
20
               THE COURT: Yes.
21
               MR. FIDDELMAN: -- perhaps sort of in light of the
22
      additional comments that the defendant has made it would make
23
      sense for the Court to confirm with the defendant his mens rea
```

at the time of committing the offense. As charged the

defendant is alleged to have conspired to deliberately defraud

auto lenders out of more than a million dollars, and the defendant has made certain comments during this allocution that are arguably inconsistent with that. And so I would just ask that the Court confirm the defendant's mens rea and intent in joining the conspiracy before accepting the plea.

THE COURT: OK.

Mr. Lev, is it correct that you entered a conspiracy to deprive banks of a substantial amount of money that you were not entitled to get from the banks? You submitted and caused to be submitted applications with statements that were false in order to get money from the banks that you were not entitled to get, is that correct?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes. Yes, your Honor. I --

THE COURT: And you knew that there were false statements in the applications and you submitted the applications with the false statements in order to get money that you were not entitled to get from the banks, is that correct?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. Me or others.

Personally not me. Me or others was involved in that. I was aware about it, and the mistake, I'm sorry for that. And I've taken the guilty charge.

THE COURT: Well, hold on. Hold on. The reason for these questions, Mr. Lev, is that you keep adding individual comments like "this was a mistake."

25

1 THE DEFENDANT: Your Honor --THE COURT: No. Hold on. Hold on. 2 3 The question is whether you personally submitted false 4 applications, or caused others to submit false applications, 5 knowing that they contained false statements in order that you 6 would get money from the banks that you knew that you were not 7 entitled to get from the banks. 8 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. With others, yes, 9 your Honor. Yes. 10 THE COURT: OK. 11 Mr. Fiddelman, do you want me to ask other questions 12 of the defendant? 13 MR. FIDDELMAN: No, your Honor. I think that 14 sufficiently clarifies it. Thank you very much. 15 THE COURT: Sure. There was one other statement by the government that I 16 17 wanted to follow up with you, Mr. Lev, and that was with 18 respect to the issue of wire fraud, which is the second object 19 of the conspiracy. The government said that you, that their 20 evidence would show that you caused others to use the internet 21 to submit the financial applications. 22 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. Yes, your Honor. 23 THE COURT: Did you do that? 24 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: OK.

1 Does the government want me to ask any other questions of the defendant? 2 3 MR. FIDDELMAN: No, your Honor. Thank you very much. THE COURT: OK. Never feel reluctant to make sure 4 5 that my allocution is sufficient. 6 THE DEFENDANT: Thank you. 7 Thank you, your Honor. I think that's MR. FIDDELMAN: sufficient. 8 9 THE COURT: OK. 10 Mr. Lev, how do you plead to the charge against you in 11 the superseding information; quilty or not quilty? 12 THE DEFENDANT: I'm guilty, sir, your Honor. 13 THE COURT: Are you pleading quilty because you are, 14 in fact, guilty? 15 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. I'm guilty. 16 THE COURT: Are you pleading guilty voluntarily, of 17 your own free will? 18 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor. THE COURT: Before I finally accept the defendant's 19 20 plea, Mr. Vinegrad, do you want me to ask any other questions 21 of the defendant? 22 MR. VINEGRAD: No, your Honor. 23 THE COURT: Do you know of any reason that I should 24 not accept his plea? 25 MR. VINEGRAD: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Before I finally accept the defendant's plea, does the government want me to ask any other questions of the defendant?

MR. FIDDELMAN: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: Does the government know of any reason that I should not accept his plea?

MR. FIDDELMAN: No, your Honor, it does not.

THE COURT: OK.

Mr. Lev, because you acknowledge that you are guilty as charged in Count One of the superseding information, because I find that you know your rights and are waiving them knowingly and voluntarily, because I find that your plea is entered knowingly and voluntarily and is supported by an independent basis in fact containing each of the essential elements of the offense, I accept your guilty plea, and I adjudge you guilty of the offense to which you have pleaded.

Mr. Lev, the probation department will now prepare the presentence report to assist me in sentencing you. You will be interviewed by the probation department. It's very important that the information you provide to the probation department be truthful and accurate. The presentence report is very important to me in my decision as to what your sentence will be.

You and your lawyer will have the opportunity to examine the presentence report, to challenge or comment on

```
anything contained in the report and then to speak on your
1
 2
      behalf at sentencing.
 3
               Mr. Fletcher, can we get a date.
               THE DEPUTY CLERK: Thursday, April 15, at 2:30.
 4
 5
               THE COURT: April 15 at 2:30 p.m. Is that
6
      satisfactory with everyone?
 7
               THE DEFENDANT: I'm just checking not Passover.
               MR. VINEGRAD: I believe it's after Passover.
 8
9
               THE DEFENDANT: OK.
10
               THE DEPUTY CLERK: Let's do another date.
11
               THE COURT: The date's OK with the defense?
               THE DEPUTY CLERK: Thursday, Thursday, April 2. Oh,
12
13
          Was April 15 Passover, counsel?
14
               MR. VINEGRAD: April 15 -- I thought I had said that
     April 15 was after Passover.
15
16
               THE DEPUTY CLERK: Oh, OK.
17
               MR. VINEGRAD: Which is fine.
18
               THE DEPUTY CLERK: OK. April 15 at 2:30.
19
               THE COURT: And OK with the government.
20
               MR. FIDDELMAN: Yes, your Honor.
21
               THE COURT: All right. Sentence April 15 at 2:30 p.m.
22
               No applications with respect to bail status.
23
               MR. FIDDELMAN:
                               That's correct. The government
24
      consents to the defendant's bail conditions remaining in effect
25
      pending sentencing.
```

THE COURT: OK. And the defense has no applications with respect to the bail.

MR. VINEGRAD: Not at the moment, Judge. I anticipate making one shortly having to do with one of Mr. Lev's daughters and his desire to see her, and she's out of the district. But I'll do that in writing after consulting with the government.

THE COURT: OK. Thank you.

MR. VINEGRAD: But thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Mr. Lev, do you understand that if you fail to return for sentencing on April 15, 2021, or any adjourned date, you will be guilty of a criminal act for which you could be sentenced to prison, totally separate, apart from and in addition to any other sentence that you may receive for the crime to which you just entered a plea of guilty?

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Do you also understand that all of the conditions of your bail have been continued and that the violation of any of those conditions can have severe consequences for you?

Do you understand that?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right.

I should add that defense submissions are due 14 days

before sentence; government submissions eight days before 1 2 sentence. All right? 3 All right. I look forward to seeing you all -- seeing 4 all of you -- on the date fixed for sentence or any adjourned 5 date. 6 Anything further? 7 MR. FIDDELMAN: Not from the government. Thank you. 8 MR. VINEGRAD: Not from the defendant. Thank you. 9 THE COURT: OK. 10 I will return Court Exhibit 1 to the government. We'll probably put it in the mail or some form of message 11 12 service. 13 Thank you, all. 14 MR. FIDDELMAN: Thank you. 15 THE COURT: Bye now. Stay well. Stay safe. 16 (Adjourned) 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25